

9
NEW DISEASES.

THE
RABIES PIRATICA,

ITS
HISTORY, SYMPTOMS, & CURE;

ALSO,
THE FUROR HIPPOCRATICUS,
OR
GRÆCO-MANIA,

WITH ITS TREATMENT.

BY BRYAN CROWTHER.

“ If wild ambition in *your* bosoms reign,
“ Alas! *you* boast your sober sense in vain;
“ In these poor bedlamites *yourselves* survey;
“ *Yourselves* less innocently mad than they.”

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR,

BY G. HAYDEN, 4, BRIDGES STREET, COVENT GARDEN.

1810.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Reader is respectfully informed, that the following sheets are not the result of any personal vanity, or assumption of peculiar knowledge; but are chiefly intended to draw the attention of enlightened practitioners to a subject of importance, and to excite them to submit their researches and opinions to the public.

The nature and manner of the attack on Mr. CROWTHER, as they admit of no justification, will doubtless operate with liberal minds as an apology for the style which he has adopted in his defence.

The pamphlet has been printed at his own expence, for the furtherance of the purpose which he has above stated, and for circulation among gentlemen of professional reputation and literary acquirements.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

<https://archive.org/details/b22391113>

Rabies Piratica.

DR. JOHNSON is certainly erroneous in supposing that this complaint is particularly prevalent among Printers.

It is not so confined, as will be particularly illustrated by the following epistolary correspondence.

It might proceed from a peculiar delicacy of sensibility and feeling towards an extensive class of his Majesty's subjects, called Authors, that the learned Doctor did not enumerate these gentlemen as especially exposed to this complaint.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Boswell Court, July 23, 1810.

SIR,

You having chosen, in your edition of your uncle's book, to state, " This author (Mr. Bryan Crowther) further indulges his satisfaction, and enhances his compliments to Mr. Ford, by taking a plate or two from his book, for the benefit and embellishment of his own· giving thus, though tacitly, an unsuspecting testimony that he held the work in high estimation :"

I shall take leave to remark, that, so far from taking a plate or two from his book, I should have been ashamed even to have borrowed from them ; so execrably executed are they, that they are a disgrace to the work. I shall bring the artist to Mr. Callow, the bookseller, and I shall see whether he will

dare to give publicity to a charge so unfounded. I trust the above statement will lead you, from a sense of candour and truth, to correct your error.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

BRYAN CROWTHER.

*To Thomas Copeland, Esq.
Golden Square.*

To this letter Mr. Copeland thought proper to transmit me the following reply :

Golden Square, July, 1810.

Mr. Copeland presents compliments to Mr. Crowther, and has been favoured with his note. Mr. Copeland has nothing to say in defence of the execution of the plates in the first edition of Mr. Ford's book, but it must be evident that the two principal plates, illustrative of the different stages of the hip-disease, are materially the same in Mr. Ford's and Mr. Crowther's books ; and as the former happen-

ed to be published many years before the latter, the one must be considered as a copy of the other. Mr. Copeland begs to observe, that in this view they were considered by the late Mr. Ford, as they will be, he thinks, by every one who compares them: and it was a feeling and expression of regret from Mr. Ford, that his plates should be re-published, which drew from Mr. Copeland the remark which is the subject of Mr. Crowther's note. Mr. Copeland does not see how an artist, or any other person, can alter the fact as it stands, of which the public is now the judge; and Mr. Copeland must therefore decline any further discussion.

If Mr. Copeland cannot, the public will see, that no one is more likely to know whether the drawings Mr. Campbell made, were taken from cases I introduced him to, or whether he copied them from Mr. Ford's book. When I mentioned to Mr. Campbell, who made the drawings, the charge preferred against me by J. C. and Mr. Copeland, he said, "I am

content that the public should so decide, but I feel justly indignant that it should be supposed I copied from plates so vile, and anatomically incorrect." To such as imagine that no other practitioner ever saw the different varieties of the hip-disease but Mr. Ford, I may stand suspected; but a reference to the plates in the one book and the other will suffice, in this instance, to shew that Mr. Campbell, the artist I employed, has no pretensions whatever to the character of an accurate copyist, except from nature. I assure the reader that some professional friends saw the patients from which the drawings were taken, and will give (if required) their testimony that I speak the truth*.

I take this opportunity of correcting an error in judgment, when I passed commendation on the first of Mr. Ford's plates.

If, in defence of the execution of the plates in the first edition of Mr. Ford's book, Mr. Copeland has nothing to say, what then has

* J.C. says, p. 255, "copied faithfully, in Mr. Crowther's third plate." Does Mr. Copeland know Mr. Langstaff, surgeon, of Fore-street? Let him enquire of that gentleman as one evidence.

he to say in favor of those given in his own edition of that work? After all the botching bestowed upon his uncle's plates, they are rendered less illustrative, and convey a more inaccurate idea of disease than they did before they were touched up, to "benefit and embellish" Mr. Copeland's edition.

Mr. T. C. has nothing to offer in defence of the engravings in his own book. The explanation of the plates he has given is precisely the same as his uncle's, which, of course, was very proper in him, as they are the same plates. But what does he mean? After giving an account of plate 1, he proceeds to inform us respecting plate 2, and states, "*this and the preceding figures were taken by Mr. Bernie.*" I hope none have been suppressed, particularly the one which might represent *the hip which stood out before, and falls in behind*. If the plate be destroyed, where is the preparation? for it must be unique, and worthy of the first place in the Hunterian museum, *and at any price*.

Now, what Mr. Copeland and his friend of Lisson Grove think, or what Mr. Ford did

think, no way interests me ; but I shall always feel anxious to merit the approbation of the public, to whose judgment I am invited to appeal, and to whose decision I shall most respectfully submit.

THE FUROR HIPPOCRATICUS,

OR

GRÆCO-MANIA ;

WITH ITS

HISTORY AND TREATMENT.

PREVIOUSLY to making any remarks upon the translation of the aphorisms given in Mr. Copeland's book, I thank the *firm* of Messrs. J. C. and T. C. for their kind hint, that "when I studied to write *fortiter in re*, I needed not to have deviated from the good old rule of writing *suaviter in modo*." This is very good, and it is very easy to observe how ready most persons are to give good advice; yet, somehow or other, how few there are disposed to follow it themselves. By way of apology, I will confess the truth, and explain how my mind became irritated.

J. C. in Mr. Ford's edition, referred the reader, in his appendix, for authorities which, so far from supporting him in his conclusions, appear-

ed to me to render him no service, and flatly contradict his assertion of "*that thus you see, there is not a single word of any importance in the original text which I have warped, violated, or translated at my own peril; they are rendered on good authorities.*" J.C.'s authorities, he imagined, would pass current with our profession; and had he not intruded himself upon us by his novel aphorisms, for the purpose of instructing us in the nature of a complaint which he knows nothing about, his time should never have been obtruded upon by me. J. C. would have it supposed that I applied for literary assistance to persons less eminent than himself. Were I to disclose the names of some of the gentlemen who assisted me in the exposition of the aphorisms alluded to, every one, I believe, except J.C. would acknowledge I could not have referred to fitter persons for the purpose; and in having so done, I performed a duty I owed to the public, and one which the importance of the subject demanded. With this aid I shall enter upon a trial of skill with him, and let the public determine on which side the question "*the weak advocate*" has been employed.

Does J. C. mean to infer, *that until Mr.*

Crowther shall have “happily illustrated the sense, and verified the truth of the former translations” of these aphorisms, which, to the profession, have not to this moment been perfectly intelligible, he should be silent?

I cannot be silent while I see them mutilated, misrepresented, and converted into absolute nonsense. Whose cause am I advocating?—That of “the celebrated physician, *who reckoned himself the seventeenth in lineal descent from Æsculapius, and who lived about four hundred years before the Christian æra, under the name of Hippocrates;*” besides, “*a sagacious and indefatigable observer,*” and one “*who wrote (as J. C. has given his opinion) with the philosophical precision of a scholar, and the elegant felicity of a gentleman*.*”

I will now proceed seriously and fairly to consider the subject of complaint with which I have charged J. C. and bring my defence to a conclusion.

* Vide Mr. Copeland's edition, p. 66; J. C.'s appendix of the same work, pp. 284 and 285.

Hippocratis Aphorismi, Sect. 5.

Aph. 59. "In such as labour long under the hip-disease, the hip-bone stands out before; there is a falling in behind, in them matter supervenes," with Mr. Copeland, and is "*supervening*" with J. C.

Aph. 60. "In such as labour longer under the disease of the hip, the hip-bone stands out, the limb wastes, and they become cripples, if they be not cauterized."

I should have been happy, in as much as the profession were agreed on the propriety of artificial discharges, and acknowledge the benefit to be derived from their use in effecting a cure of the hip-disease, if Mr. Ford had proceeded no farther, respecting the aphorisms, than noticing the advantages of the treatment suggested by Hippocrates.

Had the late Mr. Ford thus far ventured, and no further, the passage was clear, safe, and *fordable*, and it would have given me pleasure to have had nothing else to have animad-

verted upon but the excellence of his book. I wish he had obtained more assistance, or that it had suggested to him, that by a vain, ostentatious display of possessing superior literary acquirements beyond others of his profession, *he might have gotten out of his depth.*

The translation which the triumvirate have given to the public, *as the true and fair meaning* of these disputed aphorisms, I shall attempt to prove to be incorrect; for it appears to me, that no disease of the nature which they mean to represent, ever did or can happen. In fact, I do consider their construction as the offspring of a visionary malady engendered in their own brain. But enough of Mr. Ford—he is no more!

“The hip stands out before.” As the Greek is the same, why not “stand out before” in both aphorisms? Before what, in common sense? They do not mean the bone stands out in the front of the thigh; if that were to happen, a complete dislocation must take place. How came they to cram in the word “before” in the second edition, as the propriety of adopting it never occurred to them in the first? “It was to answer a purpose as

contemptible as it will appear ridiculous *.” I will explain, by adverting to one of J.C.’s authorities, how far he is capable of misrepresentation, and let the reader judge.

In their *never-to-be-forgotten* appendix, page 271, second edition, J. C. says, “that there is certainly a ‘falling in of the hip behind,’ is neither denied nor disputed. Mr. Crowther, in his book, page 278, admits that ‘the falling in of the *nates*, or hip behind, is one of the characteristics of the hip-disease, properly represented in Mr. Ford’s first engraving,’ and well copied in Mr. Crowther’s third plate.”

In my book, to which he has referred, he has wilfully misrepresented the passage. It is thus—“The elongation of the thigh, the extenuation of the limb, and the falling in of the nates behind, are characteristically represented in Mr. Ford’s first engraving, in which it is proper to observe that there is no mark of suppuration.”

* Messrs. J. C. and T. Copeland, as gentlemen true to the text, will furnish us with the Geek for the word *before*. Is it to be found in J. C.’s “*con amore*” edition of the aphorisms of Hippocrates?

J.C. says, in all the former translations, with no essential difference, there is nothing said of the falling in of the hip *behind*, either in this or in the following supplemental aphorism. Who is surprised, that what an author never did write or say, can never appear?

I was astonished at J. C.'s account of what, he said, I had stated; I found, however, by a reference to my book, that I had not made myself quite such an ignoramus, although the word *behind* was superfluous in a surgical sense. J.C. prides himself upon the propriety of this part of his translation; but I should like to know, when he considers the relative situation of his own posteriors, if he thinks the *nates* likely to fall in, in any other place than *behind*, if they fall in at all?

One absurdity begets another, and that is the construction he has put upon *nates*, which he has rendered hip. The appearance noted by the artist is from a wasting of the glutæi muscles*; they, together with the extenuation and elongation of the limb, are characteristic

* Glutæus, γλῦταιος, from γλῦτος, the buttocks. Turton's Medical Glossary.

effects of one species of the hip-disease. The wasting of the limb causes the appearance of that part called the great trochanter of the thigh-bone seemingly to stand out ; this appearance is deceptive, and the apparent prominence is not before nor behind, but external and lateral, which is the proper situation of the thigh-bone.

This species of affection of the hip-joint, which is attended with seemingly a lengthened state of limb, arises from a cause explained in my book ; but this cannot be the complaint alluded to by Hippocrates in his aphorisms, for, as the elongation is very visible, surely such a conspicuous symptom could not have been by him entirely overlooked.

Independent of the interpolation of the word hip, why did J. C. omit the observation, that “ there was no mark of suppuration,” but, because it would have condemned his translation.

*Consideration of πάλιν, retro, behind, and
J. C.'s authorities.*

To thus rendering this word with great submission, there is, I think, every objection ;

nor does it appear to me that J. C. is at all supported by the examples he has adduced.

Πάλιν is used, he says, for *retro*, *behind*; admitted by our joint auxiliary, the *Lexicon*; but how that meaning can be made subservient to the explanation of the subsequent authorities J. C. produces, I am utterly at a loss to conceive.

But as to his illustrious friend, Bellerephontes, I think J. C. had better have left him *behind* *.

* ——— Τοι δ' ἔτι πάλιν διοκόνδε νέοντο,
Πάντας γὰρ κατέπεφνεν ἀμύμων Βελλεροφόντης.

*It vero nequaquam retro domum iverunt,
Omnes enim interfecit eximius Bellerephontes.*

But they by no means returned home again,
For the illustrious Bellerephontès slew them all.

H. A. 380.

Χωόμενος δ' ὁ γέρων πάλιν ὤχελτο.

Iratus itaq; senex retro abiit.

CLARKE.

Therefore the old man, enraged, went back again.

H. A. 214.

———— πάλιν ἄγεν ὄξεις ὄγχοι.

———— *retro curvati sunt acuti hami.*

CLARKE.

The sharp hooks were bent backward.

H. E. 257.

Τέτω δ' ἔτι πάλιν αὐτὶς ἀποΐσεται ὡκίεις ἵπποι.

Hos autem non iterum retro auferent veloces equi. CLARKE.

The swift horses shall not carry them back again.

J. C. remarks, “thus Hippocrates distinctly points out both *what falls in*, and where the *falling in is*, and clearly intimates a peculiar early period of the disease, viz. when *this ‘falling in of the nates, or hip behind,’* becomes first observable or evident.”

This gentleman says, “the meaning of an author can only be ascertained by what he himself says on the subject.” J. C. is fond of my expressions. I ask him where did he meet with all this? It exists no where but in his head. This falling in behind, as he calls it, is nothing more nor less than a diminished condition of the muscles of the buttocks; they are reduced in size, have lost their plumpness, therefore appear flat; and this is his mighty discovery; and, with unparalleled assurance, quotes me as authority for the hip falling in behind!!

As the aphorism does not point out any thing of the kind, how came he by all this information?

The falling in of the *nates* behind was Mr. Campbell's expression at the time he was taking the drawing not from Mr. Ford's book, as I have been charged with, but the

patient's *nates*. I incautiously adopted the expression, and inadvertently gave it a place in my book.

J. C. finding the *nates* arranged by Mr. Campbell, was determined that they should not be cramped for room ; to effect this purpose, a very natural' idea occurred to him, which was, that the "*joint stands out before.*"

" *In such as labour long under the hip-disease, the joint stands out before, the hip falls in behind, in them purulent matter is supervening.*"

It appears that Hippocrates——No, no, it is J. C.'s *modesty*—it was himself who "intimated a peculiar early period of the disease, viz. when the falling in of the *nates*, or the hip behind, becomes first observable or evident." Thus much as to time. If he had asked me to have arranged the aphorism for him, it would have been transposed, *as the hip falls in behind, the joint stands out before.*

Mr. Copeland's Aphorism.

In such as labour long under the hip-disease, *the hip-bone stands out before*, there is a *falling in behind**, in them matter supervenes.”

J.C. and T.C. disagreed when they got half way through the *passage*, when the old gentleman managed his business in a twinkling, as appears by the arrangement I made, but the young gentleman, not being determined, nodded an *intelligitur*, and went behind.

Mr. Copeland has stept from his surgery, to commit—what?—why, murder against grammar and common sense. He has converted the words *χαί παλιν ἐμπιπεί* into a substantive, &c. as “*there is a falling in* ;” but upon any other authority than *Licentia, Aphoristica*, is best known to himself.

If he should become an editor of a Greek grammar, I hope he will not prove “*ungra-*

* See the engraving I am accused of having copied.

cious," as it would be rather bordering on "unthankfulness" not to give the verb, which has afforded him so much assistance, precedence to the other parts of speech.

Though there is neither sense nor meaning, yet I perceive a great deal of art and design in the application of the sentence: the one refers to the *plate*, while the old gentleman has my written authority for his accuracy. I may be accused of being ungratefully choleric, when these exertions "*were made most evidently with a sincere desire of rendering it (the translation) less liable to the dislike of Mr. Crowther, and more acceptable to his learned friend*" !!!

Mucor Articulorum.

Μυξᾶ, *mucus*. J. C. says, page 258, "It might have fully answered his (my) purpose, and been no prejudice to his (my) argument, if Mr. Crowther had just remarked, that though I considered *suppuraciones* and *mucos* words of the same import, or very nearly so—" My choler rises at such an insult—to make a

distinction himself, and then call upon me to acknowledge they are of the same import!

Galen, allowedly the most accurate commentator on Hippocrates's aphorisms, as well as Fabricius of Aquapendens, on the same subject, write decidedly as to the condition or nature of the secretion effused within the articulation*.

Fœsius and Gorræus† maintain a similar doctrine as to the quality of the fluid effused; but yet J. C. cannot discriminate between secretions attendant upon a morbid state of a joint, and the one which is produced by the occurrence of inflammation, which can alone render the effusion of a purulent nature.

* Sæpe in articulis humor pituitosus acervatur, quem myxam appellat (Hippocrates) a quo madefacta articulationis ligamenta, laxiora redduntur: atque ideo facile a cavitate articulus excidit, et rursus non cum difficultate incidit.

GALEN in *Aphor. Hippocr. Com.* 6.

HIPPOCR. *Aphor.* 59, § 6.—In quo aphorismo Hippocr. causam assignat læsi articuli femoris, quod excidat, et recidat; quam in pituitam rejicit mucosam; *et est, ut puto ille mucus, qui naturaliter solet contineri in articulorum cavitate, copia tamen plus æquo adauctus.*—HIERON. FABRICII *Opera Chirurgica*, c. 106, p. 643.

† Vide appendix.

I would ask J. C. whether the circumstance of there being much, little; or no inflammation, should have any influence with respect to the treatment of the disease, or the smallest tendency to effect a change with regard to the quality of the fluid?

I conceived my time would have been mis-spent by entering into a chemical investigation of the properties of *pus* and *mucus*.

A minor student knows, that if any inflammatory disposition in the joint prevails, what remedies are most essential to its removal, and at the same time will employ such applications as are best calculated to promote the disposal of the tumefaction by absorption. The young student would have adverted to the painful state of the joint, which, with the febrile condition of the patient, would have formed to an intelligent mind something like a criterion to ascertain whether the joint was or was not in a positive state of suppuration.

Dr. Parr, (J. C. says) mentions the difficulty of distinction between *pus* and *mucus*. This is well enough for a *chemist*, or a man

like J. C. to ascertain; while the first immersed his fingers in the secretion, to discover something as a furtherance to science, the latter grubbed in it for the luxury of filth*.

Let us examine a tumor, the contents of which are ascertained to be fluid; it is luckily absorbed. How is any man to know whether this fluid was *pus* or not, but by ascertaining the pain attending such swelling, and the effects upon the health which such a complaint would have had upon the system, had there been any inflammatory tendency.

J. C. I am afraid, will still misapprehend me. But if he really wishes to know *pus* from *mucus*, I would have him try the following experiment:—Let Mr. Copeland introduce into his nostrils a dossil of lint charged with

“The English word *muck* suggested itself as the only derivative from the Greek root, and the nearest of kin to $\mu\upsilon\chi\alpha$; 'tis precisely the very thing in Arabia; but it was obviously not admissible here. The other various significations of $\mu\upsilon\chi\alpha$, for various they are, deny it who will, were as little to my liking. The *humor de naribus*, “the snot of the nose,” was not suitable; the *elichinium lucernæ*, “the matter about the wick of a lamp,” would not do in this case; nor the *mucor in testudinibus*, “snail lime,” and even the best of them, the *mucus in ostreis*, “oyster juice,” was not in season.”—J. C.’s note, p. 250, Copeland’s edition.

red precipitate, and I am persuaded, that the next morning the copious efflux of purulent matter will explain *sensibly* to him the difference between the secretion of *pus* and the *humor de naribus*. This seems an excellent remedy for complaints of the head in which there is *rheum* for intellect. It is also useful for such who have *affected vision*, and *cannot see*, especially if from the above cause.

I again peremptorily deny that $\mu\upsilon\chi\alpha$, *mucor articularum*, has various meanings; it signifies *mucus*, and not suppuration.

J. C. would have it imagined it was a mere mistake in the medical acceptance of the words *suppurationes* and *mucres*. No such thing. If that even had been the case, a man who presumes to instruct the profession to which he does not belong, is nevertheless accountable for his errors, and deservedly subjects himself to the penalties annexed to the commission of them.

An instance of the unpleasant consequence of improperly substituting one word for another, and the ridicule which succeeded the mistake, is well instanced in the following fact :

I shall avoid giving the name or place of abode, and thereby manifest that on some occasions I am capable of *proper politure and judicious curtailment*. A physician met an apothecary at a patient's house; and, after the doctor had written his prescription, he took from the table, in the presence of the patient, a phial of medicine, the learned gentleman had prescribed the day before, and observes to the apothecary that he did not think his drugs were of the best quality; to which the apothecary, who, by this remark, was placed in a *truly awkward situation*, after a little recovering himself, made this reply:—"They must, sir, indeed be very bad, if they are like your Latin." The doctor, *iratus itaq*, returned back again home, but not *behind*. In a few weeks from this visit was published, with his name, a collection of medical cases, written in elegant and classic Latin. He was complimented greatly on this production. The lapse only of a very short time brought to light the following circumstance: Some officious persons circulated the report that the Latin was not the doctor's, for none but an ignoramus would have substituted the word *materia* for *pus*. This mistake proved unfortunate, as it let the cat out of the

bag. It soon spread over the town that the cases were put into Latin by a dealer in crockery ware, and the doctor's literary fame expired in a *crack*.

Examination of J. C.'s Aphorism.

I shall give him every advantage by referring to that translation, which is now, by “*revisal, and a stricter adherence to the original text, rendered less liable to misrepresentation.*”

“In such as labour under the hip-disease, the joint stands out before, the hip falls in behind, in them purulent matter is supervening.”

I shall bring his *nates* to an anchor, by asking what has become of that little insignificant word *καί*, *et*, and ?

For what purpose did J. C. omit this conjunction? Could J. C. have translated the aphorism as he has done, but by leaving out this word, and thereby depriving *εμπροσθεν* of its legitimate nominative case? I shall close

my evidence by asking J. C. how the same part can stand out *before*, and fall in *behind*?

I have J. C.'s authority for this information. Fabricius said, "Hippocrates was, when he wrote his aphorisms, an old man, and in the zenith of his knowledge and skill." It is not for me to give to, or withhold from, J. C. a similar compliment, but I will submit to public opinion, whether he has proved himself a person who *cognitor aphorismos exposuit*!!

I shall take leave of Mr. Copeland, by addressing to him the following letter:—

SIR,

YOUR uncle, Mr. Ford, you say, "*for all his modesty,*" was far from being unskilled in the original text. We have only your word for that, as his translation of the 59th aphorism, in the first edition of his book, gives a complete denial to your assertion. It appears to me that the uncle and nephew were taught at the same school, and by the same master. Am I

to presume that your uncle bequeathed to you his *modesty* by way of legacy? If so, it is very conspicuous in the following paragraph: “The translations being now made more *literal*, are rendered less *exceptionable*; most of the objections to them are no longer *applicable*, and they seem, in their *more simple and concise form*, less dissimilar to the *style and manner* of Hippocrates!!!”

I have purposely enumerated your deviations from accuracy; and really in this kind of art you exceed any I ever knew; three misrepresentations in less than six lines of your own book!! I believe your friend so beset and confused you, that you laboured under a *kind* of literary mania. Do not mistake yourself; I do not attribute your complaint to too much learning, but the incessant bewildering of J. C.

Who doubted the propriety of your uncle's referring to the doctrine of Hippocrates?—Before he held a probe in his hand, Mr. Pott had established the efficacy of issues in the hip-disease*.

* I speak of having been witness to the application of this treatment, in St. Bartholomew's Hospital, so far back as 1783.

Why could not Mr. Ford be content with the practice? Because J. C. would not let him, as he would not let you.

In having gone the lengths you have in support of your uncle's opinions, you have something like excuse, but to proceed to such an extent, to feed the vanity of a weak, silly man, as to lend your name, and thereby surrender to him your professional judgment, though it may move my pity, excites my astonishment!

I have no enmity towards you, notwithstanding the injury you intended me. But let me place you in your own eyes, as you must seem in those of other people. Your misrepresentations with respect to the aphorisms are palpable and glaring; and for whom and for what have they been made? For him who rendered your uncle (a respectable surgeon) contemptible. And for yourself what has he not done, to establish a character in every respect remote from that which is desirable, either as a surgeon or a scholar?

Notwithstanding your deluded fascination in attending to the dictates of J. C. you are, I

am informed, very respectable as a surgeon; but how far you have succeeded in rendering the translation of the aphorisms less objectionable in the second than the former edition of Mr. Ford's book, let the reader judge for himself.

I am, Sir,

With every wish for your future prosperity,

Your obedient, humble Servant,

BRYAN CROWTHER.

To Thomas Copeland, Esq.

Golden Square.

The compliment that has been paid me by J. C. is of the most flattering nature, and one, which no individual, in any situation of life, ever before received. What can a reader of this address think of the person who is the object of it, inasmuch as his very blunders are brought forward as authorities in favor of a translation! Nay, so flattering and complimentary has his conduct been towards me, that he has even altered the *original text* in com-

pliance with my *mistake*. How particular must be my obligations to this gentleman, when he says, “that there is not a single word in the original text of any importance which I have knowingly warped, violated, or translated *meo periculo*.” Sure enough, but he cheated the devil, and imposed upon his reader, by not adding the word *omitted*. There is a salvo for a *jesuitical conscience*!!!

It appears, pages 66, 67, by MS, dated March 11, 1810, that the late Mr. Ford, “with a view of shortening *disagreeable disputations*,” arrived at this conclusion, “that so long as *χαυθῶσιν* cauterized, cannot be got rid of as spurious, or an interpolation, it cannot possibly be denied, that Hippocrates was *perfectly sensible* of the great use of issues made by caustic, towards effecting the cure of the diseased hip-joint, and treated this complaint in a mode similar to what is now practised.”

If such were Mr. Ford's idea of the subject, why should he give a translation of the aphorisms at all? Might he not have been content with the curative mode suggested by “*that celebrated physician*?”

How happened it *και παλιν εμπιπτει*, be translated in the body of the book, *there is a falling in behind*, but because it should correspond with *the hip falls in behind* in the appendix; for if they had englished the conjunction *και*, *and*, then both of their translations would have proved erroneous.

I shall close this subject by a reference to the note, pages 254 and 255; “*Ἰσχιον* signifies the hip-joint, and, in that sense, it is the nominative to the verb *εξισταται*. *Ἰσχιον* signifies the hip, and, in that sense, with the addition of *παλιν*, in the sense of *retro*, “behind;” it is likewise the nominative to the verb *εμπιπτει*, and denotes the falling in of the *nates*, or hip behind, one of the characteristics of the disease, properly represented in Mr. Ford’s engraving, and copied faithfully in Mr. Crowther’s third plate.”

What misrepresentation!—the *nates* are the buttocks; and, separately viewed, how can they be considered the hip?—The hip is a whole, composed of several parts.

This renowned expositor of Hippocrates

has said, “ that ἵσχιον is the nominative to ἐξίσταται; it is likewise the nominative to ἐμπίπτει.” To be sure it is—but where, in the original text, can be found the Greek expressive of the word *nates*, or hip?

In the original text; ἵσχιον is a nominative to the two verbs, to which it is connected by the conjunction χαί, *et, and*, and therefore can be allowed two meanings.

I shall english this part of the aphorism by J. C.’s note. “ *The hip stands out before, and falls in behind.*” Now, instead of a joint, let us suppose an army: *Exercitus extat et retro incidit*, “the army stands out before, and falls in behind.” Here is generalship!—was ever any thing like it before effected? Were there a vacancy for Commander in Chief, I think J. C.’s abilities entitle him to the appointment; for never, till now, could it be supposed, a line of military capable of performing two such opposite evolutions by one and the same movement.

If government would hearken to my suggestion, they would appoint J. C. Commander in Chief of His Majesty’s forces on the Continent, to meet Bonaparte’s army;

he would be more than a match for that general, as the same number of men, at the same instant, would stand out *before* to oppose him, and their falling in *behind*, would form a *corps de reserve*.

In page 64, I am accused of animadverting upon the translation given in the former edition of Mr. Ford's book, "with unbecoming warmth, and a degree of asperity that the occasion did not call for."

I am of opinion, that when a man has written to mislead, no animadversion can be too strong; and I so much approve of what I then said, as applicable to J.C. in my appendix, that I shall re-print it, as well as the note inserted at the end of my book, with the aphorisms in their original text, wishing to put the literary reader in full possession of what is necessary for his due consideration of their translation, without subjecting him to the expence of purchasing either Mr. Ford's book or my own.

"Let the reader keep to the original text of Hippocrates himself, in a consistent persuasion, that the meaning of an author can only be ascertained by what he himself says on the subject."

J. C. acknowledges that he is bordering on four-score : he might, I think, have employed his time to some useful and honourable purpose. If he makes a respectable figure, it must be consoling to him ; on the other hand, if he sees before his eyes a glaring instance of having placed himself *in a truly ridiculous situation*, let him make the only atonement in his power, by an acknowledgment of his errors, and a confession of the sincere contrition he feels, for having grossly misled the nephew of that gentleman whom he stiles a “ sincere friend,” and to whom he affects to be a “ real well-wisher.”

BRYAN CROWTHER.

August 3, 1810.

APPENDIX.

MR. FORD's publication on the hip-disease, is a well written performance ; and the student will derive considerable practical information from its perusal. It was with regret I noticed in it a translation of the fifty-ninth and sixtieth aphorisms of the sixth section of Hippocrates ; because it appeared to me, that neither would the disease bear Mr. Ford out in his interpretation, nor could he be justified by the original text in translating these aphorisms in the manner he has done.

Mr. Ford says, in the sixty-third page of his book, "I think I may venture to affirm that the doctrine of Hippocrates, if the aphorisms alluded to are literally translated, is very clear and comprehensible to those who are conversant with the disease, and may amount to neither more or less than what follows.

“ Aph. 59.—In the progress of the hip-disease, the standing out of the hip-bone, or its external projection, and the falling in of the *nates* behind are prognostics of suppuration.

Aph. 60.—When, in this complaint, the hip-bone stands out, the limb wastes, and the patient must necessarily halt, unless he be cauterized.”

I shall first insist that the appearances described in the fifty-ninth aphorism form neither an indication nor a prognostic of suppuration.

By suppuration may be understood the formation or production of abscess: I have never found it necessary in my own practice to advert to the figure of the limb, in order to ascertain the existence of matter; for the sensations of patients, their state of health, and the fluctuation perceived in the part, have rendered me acquainted with, and themselves sensibly alive to, the nature of their situation.

It is obvious that the latter aphorism applies to a condition from which the party might be relieved, and in which lameness may be avoided; now I am inclined to believe that

no such case of diseased hip, as that described by Mr. Ford in his translation of the fifty-ninth aphorism, has ever occurred without the patient being irretrievably maimed. I mean that in those cases of hip-affection, which have advanced to the period of suppuration, the patients have been irrecoverably crippled; consequently lameness could not have been prevented by the application of the cautery, as intimated and directed by Hippocrates in his sixtieth aphorism.

Experience has taught me, that cases, in the incipient stage of the complaint, may recover, previous to the occurrence of suppuration, and thus that lameness may be altogether obviated. I could also adduce, on this point, the testimony of other surgeons.

The elongation of the thigh, the extenuation of the limb, and the falling in of the *nates* behind, are characteristically represented in Mr. Ford's first engraving, in which it is proper to observe, that there is no mark of suppuration.

The second plate is also a very just exemplification of the appearance induced by a carious state of the bones. The shortening of

the limb, and the outward marks of repeated suppurations are well depicted : and, if there were any correctness in Mr. Ford's translation of this aphorism, I will predict, that the patient, whose case furnished the drawing, will carry with him through life the prognostics of suppuration : as the projection of the hip, and falling in of the *nates* behind, will remain with him to the latest period of his existence.

These appearances are, in fact, consequences of the disease, and never can be regarded as prognostics of suppuration ; and, although it be true, that the complaint may have arrived at the height, which is intimated in Mr. Ford's translation of the 59th aphorism, and abscesses have occurred ; yet these collections of matter do not take place, on account of the projection of the hip-bone, and the falling in of the *nates behind*, but are the ordinary effects of the disorder, with all its ill consequences to health, and its destructive influence on the affected limb.

Should a knowledge of the disease give me any advantage over Mr. Ford's friend, and teach me, that the interpretation insisted upon by J. C. of Lisson Grove, cannot be supported

by the actual occurrences of the complaint, I shall have done my duty, as a practitioner of surgery, in rescuing Hippocrates from the imputation of inaccurate prediction, or of deficient information on this subject.

If I speak confidently in favor of the former translations, which have, until the publication of Mr. Ford's book, been received and considered, with no essential difference, as expressing the true meaning of these very aphorisms, I am justified by finding, that Galen, and every commentator on the works of Hippocrates, are in support of my convictions in favor of the old translators.

In the first of these aphorisms, J. C. of Lisson Grove, renders the words *και παλιν εμπιπτει*, *et retrorsum incidit, and falls in behind*. In support of this, he tells us, that the word *παλιν* signifies *retro, retrorsum, and contra, behind*, as it does *rursum* and *iterum, again*; but, from any of the passages quoted by him, we cannot see in what manner the word, though it may be rendered *retro*, can, with any degree of propriety, be translated by the English term *behind*; nor, do we think that this adverb corresponds with the Latin *retrorsum*, which he uses. But J. C. commits a

greater error in his translation of the word $\mu\upsilon\chi\alpha\iota$, which he calls *suppuraciones*. We apprehend, that it will not be deemed too bold an assertion, when we maintain that the word can have no such meaning: $\mu\upsilon\chi\alpha\iota$ implies strictly *muci* or *mucres*; this signification is warranted both by the derivation of the word, and its acceptation by the best commentators.

Foesius, in the 254th page of that part of his work, entitled, *Œconomia Hippocratis Alphabeti serie distincta*, defines $\mu\upsilon\chi\alpha$ to be “*humor ille pituitosus et lentus qui naturaliter in articulorum acetabulis continetur* ;” he adds, moreover, the following emphatical words, by way of illustration, “*mucus aut mucor, qui cum purus sit, et secundum naturam se habeat, bene valentes et facile mobiles articulos reddit: ac si contra naturam succreverit et redundarit, nimio humore articulorum ligamenta imbibens et lubricans, eorum prolapsiones facit. Sic. aph. 59, lib. vi. $\mu\upsilon\chi\alpha\iota$ et mucres supervenientes femoris caput læve et lubricum reddentes, in causa sunt ut facile sua cavitate excidat.*”

$\mu\upsilon\chi\alpha$, as appears in Goræus, signifies that “*mucor qui est in articulis, in spatiis internis*

continetur" and not suppuration*. I will subjoin the words of Goræus, $\mu\upsilon\chi\alpha$, *mucor*, *mucus dicitur ab Hippocrat. humor pituitosus, lentus et albus. Is in partibus exanguibus, ossibus et cartilaginibus colligi consuevit; cum ad eam imbecilitatem pervenerint ut alimentum suum nequeant concoquere.*

After these proofs of the clear and plain meaning of the word $\mu\upsilon\chi\alpha$, we are rather surprised at the pertinacity with which J. C. insists upon the propriety of rendering it *suppurationes*; wishing, however, to bring this matter to a conclusion, we beg leave to quote a passage from the appendix to Mr. Ford's observations on the disease of the hip-joint. In page 250, we find J. C. expresses himself thus: "to the rendering the word $\mu\upsilon\chi\alpha$, which I have translated *suppurationes*, although it has various significations, there cannot, I believe, be any solid objection: in vindication of the sense in which I have taken it, I appeal to Goræus, who expounds it in the same meaning with regard to this very aphorism."

In answer to the above, we deny that the

* *Vide Goræi Opera sub voce.*

word has various significations ; it signifies *muci*, and not *suppurations*, consequently there is every objection to its being translated *suppurations*.

If J. C. should feel himself awkwardly situated, he is rendered so by his friend, Mr. Ford, probably not acquainting him that *mucus* and *pus* are distinct things. In justice to J. C. however, it ought to be stated, that a gentleman, pre-eminently distinguished by his profound knowledge of the Greek language, would, when I stated the question, have committed the same error, but for my explanations, conceiving that *mucus* or *pus* might be used indifferently ; from this circumstance it may be surely inferred, that, however eminent a man may be for Greek literature, he is not therefore sufficiently qualified to judge of medical subjects, unless assisted by other advantages.

It is really a matter of astonishment, that an appeal should have been made to the works of Gorraeus ; in which I positively assert that there will not be found any thing which could, by the most forced construction, justify us in assigning any such meaning to the word $\mu\nu\xi\alpha$

as the matter produced by suppuration, or *pus*. I am at a loss to conceive, unless J. C. acknowledges that he is unacquainted with the distinction which medical men have established between *pus* and *mucus*, what apology he can offer for such an unwarranted assertion as, “thus you see that there is not a single word of any importance which I have warped, violated, or translated at my own peril.”

Having thus, I trust, shewn the impropriety of adopting either Mr. Ford's, or his friend's translation from the authorities which they themselves have produced, I shall take the liberty of referring the reader to any of the old commentators on the works of Hippocrates, for they all, without any material difference, agree as to the proper interpretation of these two aphorisms.

Mr. Ford judiciously requested a learned friend, whose impartiality is the more to be respected, as he is not of the medical profession, to furnish him with a new translation of these aphorisms, that coincides with his own opinions. I also have propounded the matter to a divine, whose character for Greek erudition, were I at liberty to disclose his

name, every English scholar would revere; and, as I find that his idea of the sense of Hippocrates differs from that of J. C. and agrees more nearly with the commonly received translations, I shall lay his opinion, and the authorities by which he supports it, before the public; and leave those, who are interested in the controversy, to form their own judgment.

Hipp. Aph. VI. Sect. 59, 60.

APH. 59. Ὀκόσοισιν ὑπο ἰσχιάδος ἐνοχλεμένοισι
 χρονίης ἐξιᾶται το ἰσχίον, καὶ πάλιν ἐμπίπτει, τετάρτοις
 μυξαι ἐπιγίνονται.

APH. 60. Ὀκοσοισιν ὑπο ἰσχιάδος ἐνοχλεμένοισι
 χρονίης το ἰσχίον ἐξιᾶται, τετάρτοις τήκεται τὸ σκέλος,
 καὶ κωλύεται ἢν μὴ καυθῶσιν.

N O T E.



“ QUIBUS à diuturno coxendicis morbo vexatis coxa excidit et rursus incidit, his mucus innascitur.” Hipp. Aph. Glasguæ, ann. 1748. Jans. ab Almeloveen.—“ Quibus longo coxendicum dolore conflictatis femoris, summum coxæ excidit rursumque recidit, iis mucrescunt.” Hipp. Aph. Vorstii. Ludg. Batav. ann. 1738.—“ Quibus ab ischiade diuturno vexatis ischium è proprio loco excidit atque rursus incidit, iis muci innascuntur.” Translatio Charterii.—“ Quibus longo coxendicum dolore conflictatis, femoris summum coxæ excidit rursumque recidit, iis mucosa ibidem pituita colligitur.” Translatio Hollerii.—Rejecting these translations, J. C. proposes his own in the following words: “ Morbo coxario diuturno laborantibus, femur extat, et retrorsum incidit; his superveniunt suppurationes.” “ In persons afflicted with a lingering disease of the hip-joint, the hip stands out, and falls in behind; in them suppurations follow.” The learned author observes, that Hippocrates uses the word ἰσχίον laxly; that ἐξίσαμαι signifies *extare, to project or stand out, as excidere, to fall out*; and that πάλιν as certainly signifies *retro, retrorsum, and contra, behind and on the other side, as it does rursus and iterum, again.*

According to my opinion, the sense of Hippocrates may be more accurately expressed in the following words: " In

“ whatsoever persons afflicted with a disease of the hip-joint
 “ of long continuance, the hip-joint stands out (from its usual
 “ situation) and falls back again into it ; in them, mucuses, or
 “ mucous secretions, are attendant symptoms.” For my in-
 terpretation of ἰσχύϊν I will quote Foesius : “ Interdum ὀμώωνυμον
 “ esse αὐτῷ καὶ τό ἄρθρον sic enim ἰσχύϊν ἐκπίπτειν dicitur, lib. de
 “ art. [pag. 638. 12. II. 825. 6.] ἀντὶ τῆ κατ’ ἰσχύϊν ἄρθρου,
 “ ut illic scribit Gal. Et. Aph. 59 & 60. lib. 6, τὸ ἰσχύϊν ἐξίσταται
 “ καὶ πάλιν ἐκπίπτει coxa cavitate suâ excidit, rursusque recci-
 “ dit, hoc est, τὸ κατ’ ἰσχύϊν ἄρθρον coxendicis articulus, ut illic
 “ scribit Gal. Sic enim de femoris capite et summo intelligitur
 “ quod coxæ inseritur, et excidere rursusque illabi potest quo
 “ modo etiam libr. de art. ὤμων ἄρθρον elabi dicitur humeri ar-
 “ ticulus ἀντὶ τῆ κατ’ ὤμων ἄρθρου, pro articulo qui est ad hume-
 “ rum. Ἀρθρον, namque eo aphorismo totam articulationem
 “ significat quæ complectitur et caput femoris rotundum ac
 “ læve et acetabulum et vinculum : idque totum ἰσχύϊν ibi
 “ dicitur.”

Because the English word “ lingering ” conveys the idea of *pain and debility*, as well as duration, I would render *χρόνως of long continuance*. I admit that I see that *extat* more accurately represents the Greek word ἐξίσταται than *excidit*. It expresses the appearance of the diseased joint, and the effect of the disease upon it.

In regard to πάλιν, the passages which J. C. quotes from Homer, and those to which he refers in other writers, shew that it means *retro* ; and I would observe, that *rursus* in the sense of *retroversus*, sometimes means more than the mere repetition of an act as expressed by *iterum*. But as in the case stated by Hippocrates, the joint returns into its former situation, I have endeavoured to avoid all ambiguity by translating πάλιν *back again*. I do not agree with J. C. in rendering the word πάλιν *behind*. Nor do I see how the English word

corresponds to the Latin word *retrosum*, which he has himself employed. But further, though it were granted that *πάλιν* sometimes means *behind* or *on the other side*, yet, in the passage we are now considering, I should not assign to it such a signification. For *ἐμπίπτειν*, though it well expresses the falling in of the bone to its proper situation, is very ill calculated to express the sinking in of the part of the hip opposite to that which stands out.—*Μύξα*, as appears from Gorræus, signifies that “*mucor, qui est in articulis, aut in spatiis internis continetur,*” and not *suppuration*. I will subjoin the words of Gorræus: “*Μύξα mucor, mucus dicitur ab Hippocrat. humor pituitosus, lentus, et albus. Is in partibus exanguibus, ossibus, et cartilaginibus colligi consuevit, cum ad eam imbecillitatem pervenerint ut alimentum suum nequeant conco-*”
“*quare.*”

That *μύξα* does not signify *suppuration*; that it *does* signify *mucous secretion*, and that the excess of secretion is injurious to the joints, will appear plainly and fully from the words of Hippocrates:—“*Μύξα πᾶσιν ἐστὶ φύσει· καὶ ὅταν αὕτη καθαρή ᾖ, ὑγιαίνοισι τὰ ἄρθρα, καὶ διὰ τῆτο διακίνηται ἐξ ἑνὸς, ὥς ἐστι θάλασσαν πρὸς ἐωυτά· πόνος δὲ καὶ ὀδὴν γίνεται, ὅταν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑγρὰσῃ ῥυῇ πονησάσῃ τὸ πρῶτον μὴν πηγνυται τὸ ἄρθρον· οὐ γὰρ ὀλισθηρὴ ἡ ὑγρότης ἢ ἐπιρρύκηται ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς· ἔπειτα ὥς πολλὴ λίην νεμομένη, καὶ ἐκ ἀρδομένη ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αἰεὶ ξηραίνεται· καὶ ὥς πολλὴ ἔσσει, καὶ οὐ χωρῆντος τῆ ἀρθρῶν ἐκχεῖ, κακῶς πεπηγυῖα, μετεωρίζει τὰ νεῦρα, οἷσι τὸ ἄρθρον συνδίδεται, καὶ ἄδετα ποίει καὶ διαλελυμένα, καὶ δια τῆτο χῶλοι γινοῦνται· καὶ ὅταν μὲν τῆτο μᾶλλον γίνεται, μᾶλλον, ὅταν δὲ ἥσσον, ἥσσον. Mucus omnibus à naturâ inest, et cum purus fuerit, bene valent articuli, ideoque faciliè moritur, cum sint inter se lubrici. Oboritur autem labor et dolor, ubi vexaverit quæ à carne fluit humiditas. Imprimis quidem rigidus fit articulus, neque enim lubrica est quæ ex carne effluxit humiditas. Deindè sua copia valdè dispersa,*

“ necque à carne irrigata, semper resiccat; cùmque eam
 “ ob multitudinem articulus capere non possit, effluit, malè-
 “ que concrescens, nervos quibus articulus connectitur, at-
 “ tollit, elaxat, et dissolvit; eamque ob causam vel majùs,
 “ vel minùs, claudi fiunt.” Hipp. p. 411.

As to the concluding word in the aphorism of Hippocrates, I conceive that neither *innasci* nor *colligi*, which occur in some of the translations, convey the meaning of ἐπιγίγνεσθαι. I should object also to the English word *follow*, proposed by J. C., because it seems to denote mere succession. The Latin word *supervenire*, which J. C. has employed, appears to me less objectionable. But the real and appropriate sense of the Greek word will be best collected from the two passages I shall quote from Gorræus and Foësius: “ Ἐπιγίγημα· idem quod συμπτωμα,
 “ quanquam aliqui ita distinxerint ut symptoma esset quic-
 “ quid præter naturam animali accidit : ἐπιγίγημα verò non
 “ omne sed quod solos morbos necessariò sequitur.

“ Hoc vocabulum purum est in usu apud Græcos, ait Gal.
 “ lib. de different. symptom. Ab illo factum ἐπιγίγνεσθαι quod
 “ apud medicos de symptomatibus dicitur quæ ipsius morbi
 “ augescentis ratione accidere solent, ait Gal. Aph. 35. lib. 6.
 “ Μεταπίπτειν verò, cùm, soluto priore affectu, alter novus inci-
 “ dit, ut notat Gal. in Aph. 11. l. 7. Gorræus.” — “ Ἐπιγίγνεσθαι
 “ est supervenire, succedere; et de iis dicitur quæ in morbis
 “ accidunt, proprièque de his quæ morbi ratione et auctæ
 “ passionis nomine succedunt. Gal. Com. ad Aph. 35. lib. 6.
 “ ἐπιγίγνεσθαι τοῖς πάθεσιν ἕτερα πάθη τε καὶ συμπτώματά τοῖς
 “ παλαιοῖς ἡγεροῖς ἔθος ἐστὶ λέγειν ὅσα κατὰ τὸν αὐτῷ πάθεσι λόγον
 “ αἰξανόμενα συμβαίνειν εἴωθε. — Morbos et symptomata morbis
 “ succedere veteres medici dicere consueverunt quæ ipsius
 “ morbi augescentis ratione accidere solent. Hinc ἐπιγίγνομενα
 “ dicuntur quæ morbis necessariò, eorumque incrementum

“ratione succedunt, eosque ex necessitate comitantur non
“symptomata simpliciter.”

I doubt whether the English language has any single word which definitely and completely expresses the meaning of ἐπιγίνωσθαι as used by Hippocrates, and therefore, with the advice of a learned person, I have said “are attendant symptoms.” But I wish the medical and the critical reader to observe that ἐπιγίνεσθαι implies not merely the *concomitant*, but necessary and aggravating circumstances of a disease.

FINIS.

Printed by GEORGE HAYDEN,
Brydges Street, Covent Garden.